



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,050	11/27/2000	Joseph G. Gatto	089070-0311365	4426

909 7590 09/11/2007
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
Eric S. Cherry - Docketing Supervisor
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

SUBRAMANIAN, NARAYANSWAMY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3692

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/722,050	Applicant(s) GATTO, JOSEPH G.	
	Examiner Narayanswamy Subramanian	Art Unit 3692	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicants' communication filed on June 21, 2007.

Amendments to claim 1 have been entered. Examiner would like to note that all IDS submitted by the applicants so far, have been considered. Claims 1-38 are currently pending and have been examined. The rejections and response to arguments are stated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-38 are rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-38, the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility.

Claims 1-38 merely recite elements of an apparatus or a system ("means for" corresponds to software program elements and not tangible hardware components) without showing any ability to realize functionality of the recited elements (i.e. functional descriptive material per se) and therefore is rendered inoperative lacking any utility. A memory for storing performance data does not show the ability to realize functionality of the recited elements.

Similarly the claimed modules are interpreted as software. Note that a computer (or software program) code cannot by itself perform the underlying function until it is loaded on some computer readable memory and accessed by the computer (or a processor).

Functional descriptive material, per se, is not statutory. This is exemplified in *In re Warmerdam* 31 USPQ2d 1754, where the rejection of a claim to a disembodied data structure

was affirmed. Thus a claim to a data structure, per se, or other functional descriptive material, including computer programs, per se, is not patent eligible subject matter.

The claims 1-38 recite a system for a non-statutory process.

The instant claims recite mathematical algorithm which solve a problem of display of information (as recited in the claims 1-38). A mathematical algorithm is defined as a "procedure for solving a given type of mathematical problem." *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 65, 175 USPQ 673, 674 (1972); *Flook*, 437 U.S. at 585 n.1. 198 USPQ at 195 n.1; *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 186, 209 USPQ at 8. **Mathematical algorithms are non- statutory because they have been determined not to fall within the § 101 statutory class of a "process."** *Benson*. "[A]n algorithm, or mathematical formula, is like a law of nature, which cannot be the subject of a patent." *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 186, 209 USPQ at 8. The exception applies only to mathematical algorithms since any process is an " algorithm" in the sense that it is a step-by-step procedure to arrive at a given result. *In re Walter*, 618 F.2d 758, 764 n.4, 205 USPQ 397, 405 n.4, (CCPA 1980); *Pardo*, 684 F.2d at 915, 214 USPQ at 676.

A mathematical algorithm is not made statutory by "attempting to limit the use of the formula to a particular technological environment." *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 191, 209 USPQ at 10. Thus, "field of use" or "end use" limitations in the claim preamble are insufficient to constitute a statutory process. This is consistent with the usual treatment of preambles as merely setting forth the environment. See *Flook* (the preamble while limiting the application of the claimed method to "a process comprising the catalytic chemical conversion of hydrocarbons" did not serve to render the method statutory); *Walter*, 618 F.2d at 769; 205 USPQ at 409 ("Although the claim preambles relate the claimed invention to the art of seismic prospecting, the claims themselves

are not drawn to methods of or apparatus for seismic prospecting"); *de Castelet*, 562 F.2d at 1244 n.6. 195 USPQ at 446 n.6 ("The potential for misconstruction of preamble language requires that compelling reason exist before that language may be given weight"). Compare *Waldbaum*, 559 F.2d at 616 n.6. 194 USPQ 469 n.6 (portion of preambles referred to in method portion of claims "are necessary for completeness of the claims and are proper limitations thereto").

Data-gathering steps

If the only limitations in the claims in addition to the mathematical algorithm are data-gathering steps which "merely determine values for the variables used in the mathematical formulae used in making the calculations." Such antecedent steps are insufficient to change a nonstatutory method of calculation into a statutory process. See *In re Richman*, 563 F.2d at 1030. 195 USPQ at 343; *Sarkar*, 588 F.2d at 1335. 200 USPQ at 139 ("If the steps of gathering and substituting values were alone sufficient, every mathematical equation, formula, or algorithm having any practical use would be per se subject to patenting as a 'process' under §101"): *Gelnovatch*, 595 F.2d at 41 n.7. 201 USPQ at 145 n.7.

The claimed inventions recite data gathering step (display of information). When viewed in light of the specification, this step constitutes data gathering. As per the court rulings cited above, the claims constitute mathematical algorithm(s) applied to data gathered in the respective process steps. The fact that a mathematical algorithm is applied to solve a problem of updating a display of information does not make the claim statutory. *Walter*, 618 F.2d at 764-65 n.4, 205 USPQ at 405 n.4. "The type of mathematical computation involved does not determine whether a procedure is statutory or nonstatutory." *In re Gelnovatch*, 595 F.2d 32, 41.201 USPQ 136, 145

(CCPA 1979). A "claim for an improved method of calculation, even when tied to a specific end use, is unpatentable subject matter under §101." *Flook*, 437 U.S. at 595 n.18, 198 USPQ at 199 n.18. Mathematical algorithms may represent scientific principles, laws of nature, or ideas or mental processes for solving complex problems. See *Meyer*, 688 F.2d at 794-95, 215 USPQ at 197. The dependent claims are rejected for the same reason and by way of dependency on rejected independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: Claim 1 recites "one or more selected contributors". However it is not clear how this selection is achieved.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: It is not clear how the recited elements are structurally related to each other. For instance how is the memory related to the performance aggregation module or the performance view module. Appropriate correction/clarification is required.

Response to Arguments

6. Amending the independent claim 1 to recite a memory for storing the determined earnings estimates performance data does not overcome the operability requirement under 35


USC 101. The claimed invention is interpreted as a collection of software elements and a memory. Applicant's arguments amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims disclose operability and the corresponding utility.

Applicant's other arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are not persuasive.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Narayanswamy Subramanian whose telephone number is (571) 272-6751. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM to 7:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached at (571) 272-6702. The fax number for Formal or Official faxes and Draft to the Patent Office is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PMR only. For more information about the PMR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Dr. N. Subramanian
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3692

September 4, 2007